

neglected. Teun Tieleman considers Galen's opinions on the seat of the intellect in connexion with both tradition and experiment. Galen made use of Erasistratus (for the arterial system) and of Herophilus (for the nervous system), and was himself responsible for some improvements in experimental method (pp. 267–8), but he fails to explain how the three parts of the soul interact physiologically. Galen, it is shown, is not so much an experimental scientist as an empirical Platonist.

Rihll and J. V. Tucker examine knowledge of materials in Classical Athens. Their particular concern is with mining and connected activities at Laurium. Silver production is described; its size and importance to Attic society are emphasized. Skill in smelting and cupelling is shown to have lacked the support of theoretical understanding. Theories of Theophrastus and others about materials are examined. A rugged realism pervades the discussion: 'Practitioners need to know what to do and when to do it; they do not need to know why something happens'. 'Know what' knowledge is not written down; it is passed on only by 'being there' and being taught by someone who has the knowledge (p. 298).

C. Anne Wilson, writing on distillation, sublimation, and the four elements, offers original insights into ancient chemistry. Her erudition is deep and extensive. She moves with ease from copper in Plato's *Timaeus* to Gnostic baptism; from the production of mercury out of cinnabar to the origins of 'Greek fire'. Her text penetrates into 'the enclosed world of the chemical art' and reveals secret wine-distilling as a cultic activity in Gnostic and pre-Christian communities.

This is an immensely instructive book. The reviewer praises editors and contributors for their scholarship. Texts are cited and translated. There are indices and a bibliography. Many of the problems cannot yet be solved, but the right questions are asked throughout.

*Trinity College Dublin*

G. L. HUXLEY

## IAMBLICHUS' LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS

M. VON ALBRECHT, J. DILLON, M. GEORGE, M. LURJE, DAVID S. DU TOIT: *Jamblich: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΥΘΑΓΟΡΕΙΟΥ ΒΙΟΥ. Pythagoras: Legende–Lehre–Lebensgestaltung*. Pp. 352. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002. Cased, €25.90. ISBN: 3-534-14945-9.

This is the fourth volume published in a series ('SAPERE') intended to present Greek and Latin texts of late antiquity in a manner showing their intrinsic interest and bringing to bear an interdisciplinary approach, for the use not only of scholars but also of a wider interested public. Iamblichus' *De Vita Pythagorica* (= *VP*) is certainly an appropriate text in this regard, and the contents of the present volume correspond to the approach to such texts proposed by the series. Thus, following a brief introduction to the life of Iamblichus and to the *VP*, we are given the Greek text and a German translation of the *VP*, followed by five essays by various scholars concerning the *VP* in itself and as compared to the Christian Gospels and to Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*. The volume also includes a bibliography and indices. Some

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

of the materials collected in this volume has appeared elsewhere and it is in particular the new parts of the book that will be noted here.

The introductory section includes a short biography of Iamblichus by Dillon, a shortened version of his contribution to *ANRW* (1987). There appears to be an error in the German version printed here, since one is given the impression (p. 20) that the *Protrepticus*, *De communi mathematica scientia* and *In Nicomachum* are separate works, different from the surviving volumes of Iamblichus' ten-volume work *On Pythagoreanism*. Lurje's (new) introduction to the *VP* correctly criticizes an old *Quellenforscher's* prejudice (on p. 25 n. 4 he gives a bibliography going back to 1871 for this prejudice!) which can only see in the *VP* a chaotic compilation of earlier materials concerning Pythagoras, and not a text intended to advocate, at the turn of the fourth century A.D., a philosophical programme, that of Iamblichus' Pythagorizing Neoplatonism. L. indicates that it was in particular an important article by M. von Albrecht published in 1966 (reprinted in this volume as Essay 2) that marked the beginning of a new and more adequate approach to the *VP*. The traditional inability to read the *VP* on its own terms extended also to a neglect of the fact that the *VP* is not a separate work, but the first part of a larger work, *On Pythagoreanism*, in which Iamblichus developed his philosophical programme. The separate publication (yet again) of the *VP* does not help in this regard, but L.'s introduction should counteract this effect in setting the *VP* in the context of the larger work to which it belongs. L. also points out that the *VP* is not a biography of Pythagoras, but a representation of a philosophical way of life (cf. Plato, *Rep.* 600b1–5), intended for the edification of the members of Iamblichus' school. (The lack of a good commentary on the *VP* noted by L. is now remedied in large part by G. Staab, *Pythagoras in der Spätantike. Studien zu De Vita Pythagorica des Iamblichos von Chalkis* [Munich, 2002].) The introductory sections by D. and L. are followed by the Greek text and German translation (with notes) by von Albrecht published originally in 1963, reprinted with some slight modifications.

Of the five essays that follow Iamblichus' text, the first (new), by Lurje, describes the *VP* as a 'Manifest der neuplatonischen *paideia*'. Through the figure of Pythagoras, Iamblichus exemplifies his conception of the goal of philosophy (assimilation to the divine) and the steps leading to this goal. L. presents (pp. 238–42) a detailed plan of the composition of the *VP*, which shows how the work corresponds to this conception (Staab, op. cit., 478–87, proposes a comparable detailed analysis of the structure of the *VP*). L. argues (p. 246) against von Albrecht (who is followed later in Essay 3 by du Toit, p. 292) that Iamblichus is not following the Neoplatonic hierarchy of virtues, and proposes an explanation for why Iamblichus chose Pythagoras as a paradigm of his philosophy. A useful note (p. 253, n. 91) discusses the matter of a possible anti-Christian motivation in the *VP*. Following the reprint as Essay 2 of von Albrecht's important 1966 article ('Das Menschenbild in Iamblich's Darstellung der pythagoreischen Lebensform'), Essay 3, by du Toit (the first of the interdisciplinary essays, all new) compares soteriological aspects of the Gospel of Luke and the *VP*. This is very well done, clear in its methodology and avoiding simplistic comparisons. What emerges is the very great difference separating Luke and the *VP*, both in the functions given to the figures of Christ and of Pythagoras in the two works, and in the ways in which 'salvation' (Christian or philosophical) is conceived. Christ is not a figure from the past, used as an example for imitation (Pythagoras in the *VP*), nor is Pythagoras the saviour, as is Christ in Luke (in the *VP* it is philosophy, transmitted to men by Pythagoras, which saves the fallen soul). The author shows how these differences are reflected in differences in narrative style in Luke and in the *VP*. In Essay 4, Dillon

suggests that the *VP* is a ‘Gospel’, a pagan refutation of the Gospel of John. D.’s contribution is rather speculative and not written on the same level of argumentation as that reached in Essay 3. In Essay 5, George compares the theories of virtues in the *VP* and in Athanasius’ *Vita Antonii*. These two texts have been compared before, but G. does not take a position on whether Athanasius actually used the *VP*. What emerges, here also, is the difference separating the virtues in the *VP* and in Athanasius, made particularly clear in G.’s analysis of the catalogue of virtues attributed to Anthony by Athanasius (cf. pp. 318–19).

This is certainly a very useful contribution to a better understanding of Iamblichus’ *VP* in its immediate context, in its structure and in the broader cultural life of late antiquity. Some of the essays represent rigorous scholarly work, whereas others would be more accessible for a wider public. The contributors do not always share the same views. But this also adds to the interest of the book.

University of Fribourg

DOMINIC J. O’MEARA

### *PRAETEXTARUM RELIQUIAE*

G. MANUWALD: *Fabulae praetextae. Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. (Zetemata 108.) Pp. 399. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001. Paper, DM 148. ISBN: 3-406-48160-4.

Scholarly accounts on serious Roman drama dealing with topics from Roman history both of the mythical past and of times closer to, or contemporary with, the playwright’s era usually occupy a short space in books on Roman theatre and its relation to Roman society (an excellent contribution to this topic is now H. I. Flower, “‘Fabulae Praetextae’ in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?”, *CQ* 45 [1995], 170–90). This is so not only because there are very few extant fragments from this literary genre (nine or ten titles, and about thirty-three fragments ranging from one word to twelve lines long), but also because so many aspects of the ‘fabulae praetextae’ are shrouded in mystery that very few questions about them may be answered with any certainty. Manuwald’s impressively learned volume, her Habilitationsschrift, may now be regarded as the most comprehensive account of all that survives from ‘plays in Roman robe’ and all that has been written on these plays from the 1820s to 2000.

M. divides her work into four lengthy chapters, accompanied by a brief concluding section. In Chapter A.I she deals with the origins and the meaning of the term ‘praetexta’. In A.II she cites and evaluates the views of grammarians, commentators, and writers of literary theory on the ‘fabulae praetextae’ (Varro, cited in Diomedes, *Ars Gramm.* 3; Evanthius, *De fab.* 4.1; Festus, *De verb. signif.* 249, 14–15 L and 480, 12–18 L; Donatus, *De com.* 6.1; J. Lydus, *De magistr. pop. Rom.* 1.40; Donatus on Terence’s *Ad.* 7; Horace, *Ars Poet.* 285–8 [with the corresponding ancient scholia]). In B.I she analyses the ancient ‘testimonia’ on individual plays of this genre: Asinius Pollio in Cicero, *Ad fam.* 10.32 (about a ‘fabula praetexta’ mentioned in association with L. Cornelius Balbus the Younger); Cicero, *Pro Sest.* 123 and the relevant Schol. Bob. (about Accius’ *Brutus*); Varro, *De ling. Lat.* 6.18–19 (about an anonymous author’s play on the rites performed on the ‘Nonae Caprotinae’); Horace, *Epist.* 2.1.93 and the corresponding ancient scholia (possibly about a play on the conquest of Corinth); *Vita*

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved